



Housing Action Plan – Draft Priority Strategies

October 19, 2021

Overview

The purpose of the Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan is to understand local housing challenges and identify opportunities to encourage creation of additional housing types that are affordable to a variety of households within the unincorporated Vancouver Urban Growth Area. This could be done through the removal of regulatory barriers and/or implementation of other strategies.

The Housing Options Study included stakeholder interviews and focus groups, a housing inventory and analysis, an audit of land use policies, zoning, and regulations, and a feasibility pro-forma analysis. Proposed Housing Action Plan (HAP) objectives were developed based on the Housing Options Study and feedback from the Project Advisory Group (PAG) and the public.

The next step is to analyze and identify priority strategies for the Housing Action Plan. The project team started with a framework developed by the Washington State Department of Commerce, and refined it to meet the needs of Clark County. The list was comprised of categories that included:

- A. Expand Zoning Permissions for Housing Development
- B. Modify Existing Regulatory Tools
- C. Process Improvements
- D. Affordable Housing Incentives
- E. Funding Options
- F. Other Strategies
- G. Displacement Strategies

Each strategy was assessed relative to the proposed HAP objectives and criteria such as timeline, cost, and administrative effort.

HAP Objectives

1. Encourage housing development that meets the needs of middle-income households who are not being served in the current housing market.
2. Develop strategies to support the development of housing that is affordable to low, very low, and extremely low-income households.
3. Encourage diversity in housing types and tenure (rental/ownership), including expanding middle housing options and increasing multifamily feasibility.
4. Encourage the creation of a broad range of housing sizes to match the needs of all types of households (families, singles, students, older adults, disabled, or other unique population groups), with a focus on 1-2 person households not being served in the current housing market.
5. Guide development of diverse housing options to areas with access to transportation corridors and transit, commercial services, schools and parks, and conversely, support development of those same amenities in areas where more housing is added.

Preliminary Assessment Criteria

1. **Timeline.** Since the “intended outcome is a list of implementation-ready/actionable strategies and recommendations for public, Planning Commission and Council,” Short-term includes implementation-ready strategies that will be adopted through this process. Medium-term strategies are those that require more work or time to implement. Long-term strategies are those that the County does not control.

2. **Cost.** A relative comparison of costs for each strategy. For example, development code changes have no/low cost. Strategies with ongoing administrative needs are medium cost. Items that require the County to invest or forgo revenues are high cost.
3. **Administrative Effort.** Strategies that primarily involve policy setup or code changes are low effort. Strategies that will require more work following the completion of this project are medium effort. High-effort strategies require substantial staff time and program setup. This includes any new or ongoing programs that need dedicated time to administer.

Update

The PAG met three times from June through August 2021 to review and comment on potential strategies within these categories. The strategies were then placed into priority tiers based on the assessment criteria and PAG discussions:

Tier 1. Strategies that can be implemented in the short-term either through the Clark County Housing Options Study and Action Plan project or on a similar timeline. The strategies typically incur low to medium costs and administrative effort for the County and have medium to high potential impacts. This category also includes “low-hanging fruit” strategies that are easy to implement and are often required for compliance with state legislation.

Tier 2. Strategies that have medium to high potential impacts, but a longer (medium) timeline for implementation.

Tier 3. Strategies that do not have a short timeline or have higher costs and administrative effort required for implementation.

Numbering is carried over from previous drafts for continuity and tracking, although a new numbering system will be used when final recommendations are prepared. Within each tier, strategies are grouped into categories based on intended outcomes:

Code Changes

Regulatory strategies center on updates to the County’s development code that expand housing development options and enhance residential development feasibility of existing housing options. Development code updates primarily apply to private development as individual projects are proposed. While code updates do not mandate that certain housing types are built, they expand opportunities and enhance development feasibility of a wider range of residential dwelling types to support a broader range of private development proposals. Select code updates also support development of regulated affordable housing, either indirectly by reducing barriers for all residential development or directly through targeted code amendments.

Affordable Housing

Strategies intended to increase the feasibility of subsidized affordable housing for low, very low, and extremely low-income households. Many of the recommended code changes also directly support affordable housing, such as reduced parking requirements, revisions to Highway 99 design standards, and permitting residential uses in commercial zones for regulated affordable housing development.

Programs and Partnerships

Strategies where the County role is to administer or support partner efforts to facilitate educational and/or financial assistance programs.

Advocacy

Advocate for state legislative changes to allow strategies and tools not currently available to the County.

Priority Strategies: Questions and Considerations

These priority strategies will serve as PAG Draft Recommendations following review at the October 26 PAG meeting and any revisions based on PAG discussions. The draft recommendations will be shared through public engagement events and meetings with Planning Commission and County Council. In December, the PAG will reconvene for a final meeting to review public feedback on agree on final recommendations.

The following is a list of questions and considerations for PAG members as they review and discuss the priority strategies. Primary questions include:

- Are there any strategies that should be added that have not yet been reviewed or discussed?
- Would you recommend reprioritizing any strategies to a different tier?
- Are there any strategies that have been removed that should be added back in?
- Are there any details within the strategies that you would recommend revising? If so, how?

Tier 1 Strategies

A-1.1.1: Lot size reductions proposed in this strategy are specific to dwelling types in zones where they are already permitted; see strategy A-5.1 for recommended lot sizes for new housing types and/or housing types expanded into new zones.

Proposed minimums in the R1 zones:

Zone	Existing	Proposed
R1-10	10,000	8,000
R1-7.5	7,500	6,500
R1-6	6,000	5,500
R1-5	5,000	4,500

Note: The names of the R1 zones currently correspond to the minimum lot sizes allowed. This correspondence would be weakened with the proposed lot size reductions: e.g., the minimum lot size in R1-10 would be 9,000 or 8,000 square feet rather than 10,000 square feet. However, no name changes for the districts are recommended at this time because of the complexity of updating names across all existing codes and plans.

Note: This strategy combines previous strategies A-1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 3.1.

A.1.1.2: The compact subdivision option grew out of APG discussions on the opportunity/demand to build small, single-family detached homes:

- Does a compact subdivision option provide a meaningful way to address the development issues of small-lot single-family detached development, or would efforts be better spent on revisions to the PUD or cottage code? Our concern was that substantially revising the cottage code could undermine the clustered nature of cottage developments, whereas developing an alternative set of standards could focus on the desired smaller scale with more flexibility for site layout concepts.
- To continue refining the compact subdivision option, further refinement of its applicability is needed.
 - Should it be limited to parcels 5 acres or smaller? What are the sizes of typical parcels available for this kind of infill development, distinct from larger lot greenfield locations?
 - Are there locational factors that should be considered, such as access to transit, infill parcels surrounded by existing development, parcels along arterial or commercial roads?

Should middle housing types be permitted and/or encouraged within these developments, or would that be considered “double dipping” to use both the compact lot sizes of this ordinance and the additional middle housing allowances for more units on a given lot?

A-2.1: No comments.

A-5.1.1: Middle housing: Consider the following minimum lot sizes for new housing types.

Zone	Proposed Single-family and duplex	Triplex	Quadplex
R1-10	8,000	8,000	8,000
R1-7.5	6,500	6,500	8,000
R1-6	5,500	6,000	8,000
R1-5	4,500	6,000	8,000

Should there be limited, objective design standards for middle housing types, such as main entrance orientation, minimum window coverage, limitations on driveway/garage width as portion of the main façade? If so, which design aspects are priorities for which middle housing types? (More examples to be provided at the meeting.) In contrast, there are no analogous design standards for single-family or duplex dwellings currently.

Are there other dimensional, site design, or building design standards that should be developed to support duplex, triplex, and quadplex uses?

Note: This strategy combines previous strategies A-1.4, A-5.1, A-5.2, A-5.3, A-5.4, and A-5.5.

A-7.1: Residential in commercial. Priority strategy targets allowing affordable housing in commercial zones, with a secondary strategy to explore greater flexibility for market-rate residential in commercial zones in B-2.1. Should there be a priority strategy related to select market-rate residential projects as well, such as:

- Allow additional market-rate housing by permitting horizontal as well as vertical mixed-use or allowing multifamily residential outright if it met minimum densities, design standards and/or served target groups such as age-restricted residents.

If so, what criteria are most important for qualifying projects?

Note: This strategy incorporates previous strategies B-2.1 and D-3.2.

B-1.1: Parking standards for duplex, triplex and quadplexes. What adjustments, if any, would you like to see to the recommended minimum of one off-street parking space per unit? Should the availability of on-street parking qualify a project for further reductions in off-street parking, or conversely, should the unavailability of on-street parking trigger a higher off-street parking requirement?

B-1.2: Note: This strategy incorporates previous strategy B-1.3.

B-1.6.1: Parking for affordable multifamily housing. Should parking requirements for affordable multifamily projects be reduced further than what is required by state regulations? Current regulations will primarily apply along Highway 99 based on transit definitions. State standards will reduce parking from 1.5 spaces for all units to 1 space per 1-bedroom unit and 0.75 spaces per studio unit, with no reductions for multi-bedroom units. Consider whether to apply parking reductions more broadly (beyond Highway 99 corridor) or more deeply (lower required ratios) as part of this priority strategy, or to consider further reductions as part of larger multifamily parking study proposed in Tier 2.

B-3.1: Note: This strategy incorporates previous strategy D-3.3.

B-3.2: Note: This strategy incorporates previous strategy B-1.4.

B-3.3: No comments.

B-4.1: ADU standards update.

- Should parking requirements be entirely eliminated for ADUs, or removed only for sites near transit consistent with new state regulations?
- Should there be opportunities to add two ADUs to a property, in line with expanded permission for triplexes and quadplexes? If so, should there be requirements about whether the two units must be attached, one attached and one detached, or any combination that fits the site?

Note: This strategy incorporates previous strategy B-1.5.

B-5.2.1: RV parks for RVs and tiny homes in commercial zones. Should expanding RV park permissions be the only priority in this round of code updates, with options to expand RV and tiny home use on individual residential lots remaining as a secondary strategy?

C-1.1.1: No comments.

F-2.1.1: No comments.

F-4.1: No comments.

D-2.3: No comments.

D-5.1: No comments.

D-1.1: No comments.

F-1.1: No comments.

Tier 2 Strategies

A-4.1: Work could be a County initiative or aligned with future review of the Countywide Planning Policy regarding the 75/25 split between single-family detached housing and alternatives to single-family detached housing with all local jurisdictions during the Comprehensive Plan update process as part of the housing affordability discussion, to see if the ratio still makes sense or should be adjusted by all jurisdictions.

Note: This strategy combines previous strategies A-4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, and a-7.2.

A-4.4: This will need to happen as part of periodic updates.

A-5.1.2: No comments.

A-5.6: Note: This strategy combines previous strategies A-5.6 and A-5.7.

B-1.6.2: Multifamily parking study. Are there particular modifications to the multifamily parking requirements or particularly types of projects that you would like to see prioritized in a future study?

B-2.1: Note: This strategy combines previous strategies B-2.1 and B-2.2.

B-2.3: No comments.

B-3.1: Note: This strategy incorporates previous strategy B-6.1.

B-5.1: Is the right placement or should it be moved to Tier 1?

B-5.2.2: No comments.

C-1.1.2: No comments.

E-1.1: Consider as part of a comprehensive study of impact fee rates and potential reductions and waivers for affordable housing while maintain current revenues.

D-4.1: Consider as part of a comprehensive study of impact fee rates and potential reductions and waivers for affordable housing while maintain current revenues.

E-1.2: No comments.

D-2.1: No comments.

C-1.2: No comments.

C-3.4: No comments.

C-3.5: No comments.

E-6.1: Note: This strategy incorporates previous strategy G-2.1.

G-1.1: No comments.

G-1.2: No comments.

G-3.1: No comments.

E-3.1: No comments.

F-2.1.2: No comments.

Tier 3 Strategies

C-1.3: No comments.

G-4.1: No comments.

Draft Priority HAP Strategies

Tier 1 Strategies

CODE CHANGES

A-1.1.1 Reduce minimum lot sizes for existing permitted housing types in low and medium-density zones to more efficiently use existing land, and make supporting revisions to maximum densities that align with new lot sizes:

- Reduce minimum lot sizes by 10-20% for single-family detached in all low-density R1 districts and increase maximum density by a corresponding 10-20%.
- Permit townhouses on lots with a minimum size of 2,000 square feet or smaller throughout the medium-density zones, by aligning and revising minimum lot sizes and maximum densities.
- Set minimum lot sizes for duplexes to match those for single-family detached in low and medium density districts, and revise maximum densities to permit a duplex on those lots.

A-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-1.1.1	●		●	●		Short	\$	Low	

A-1.1.2 Develop a compact subdivision option distinct from both cottage housing and PUD path as a way to develop smaller, single-family detached dwellings at lower price points. Include provisions to:

- Apply only to parcels that are up to 5 acres in size in the R1-5, R1-6 and R1-7.5 zones that are located near transit, within developed areas, or other priority locations.
- Set minimum lot sizes at 50-70% of the size of lots in the underlying zone with corresponding increase to maximum density.
- Match scale of dwellings to smaller sized lots, with maximum lot coverage of 40% and 25-foot height limit.
- Treat perimeter for compatibility with surrounding residential development including landscaping, setback and/or fencing options.

A-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-1.1.2	●		●	●		Short	\$	Medium	

A-2.1 Increase minimum density in high-density zones from 47-60% to 60-80% of the maximum density, to support multifamily residential and smaller housing units.

A-2	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-2.1	●		●		●	Short	\$	Low	

A-5.1.1 Expand middle housing types permitted in the low and medium residential zones to expand housing options, and set dimensional and density standards equivalent to single-family detached dwellings to enhance development feasibility.

- Permit duplexes throughout the low-density zones, on both corner and mid-block lots with the same minimum lot size as single-family detached dwellings and effectively double the maximum density. Continue to permit through a building permit review without requiring separate land use review, aside from any land division to create lots.
- Introduce triplex and quadplex uses (attached and detached configurations) in low and medium-density zones, and permit on minimum lot sizes/densities analogous to townhouses. Permit through Type I site plan review.
- Allow townhouses in low-density zones on lots down to 2,000 square feet.
- Allow and encourage internal conversion of existing homes into additional units as a “plex”, including nonconforming development. Consider standards such as modifications to setbacks and lot coverage, and/or flexible parking standards to incentivize retention of existing homes.

A-5	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-5.1.1	●		●	●		Short	\$	Medium	

A-7.1 Expand options for affordable residential uses in commercial zones by allowing eligible (Washington state Housing Finance Commission eligibility) affordable multi-family housing with no commercial component in all commercial zones

A-7	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-7.1	●	●	●	●	●	Short	\$	Low	

B-1.1 Introduce minimum parking requirements specific to duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes that are less than parking requirements for single-family dwellings to balance site development feasibility with desire for off-street parking options, beginning with a 1 space per unit requirement. Consider opportunities for tandem parking and/or on-street parking to meet some of the parking requirements, and reductions for projects near transit.

B-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-1.1	●	●	●			Short	\$	Low	

B-1.2 Revise minimum parking requirements for narrow lots, specifically townhouses. Eliminate the separate narrow lot standard for 2.5 spaces per unit and apply the same single-family detached standard of 2 off-street spaces, which can be met through tandem parking (one in garage and one in driveway). Adjust driveway spacing and access requirements for townhouses and require paired driveways (side-by-side on separate lots), to balance preservation of on-street parking, a walkable sidewalk realm, and development feasibility.

B-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-1.2	●		●			Short	\$	Low	

B-1.6.1 Reduce parking requirements for all multifamily including regulated affordable housing with access to transit (within one-quarter mile of service two or four times per hour at least 12 hours per day) to a maximum of one per bedroom or 0.75 space for a studio. Required to implement SHB 2343 provisions applicable to the County.

B-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-1.6.1	●	●	●	●	●	Short	\$	Low	

B-3.1 Make limited revisions to Highway 99 Plan to promote feasibility of desired residential development:

- Exempt regulated affordable housing projects from certain Highway 99 multifamily design standards.
- Apply new development standards for middle housing types proposed herein in lieu of specific Highway 99 standards, akin to how cottage development is currently treated.

B-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-3.1	●	●	●	●		Short	\$	Low	

B-3.2 Revise cottage housing standards, to increase development feasibility focused on creating clusters of small-scale units while providing a coherent site design with a balance of amenities.

- Allow densities of a minimum of 25 units per acre, either through increasing allowed density or as a result of increases to base density proposed in Strategy A-1.1.
- Permit a greater variety of attached or detached units that maintain the clustered layout around the common courtyard.
- Reduce quantity of common and private open space required per dwelling with provisions focused on quality and accessibility of such spaces. Require a minimum percentage of common open space to be landscaped.
- Provide a variety of parking configurations including shared parking areas and individual garages.
- Set required off-street parking at one space per unit, with potential reductions for projects near transit and/or on-street parking availability.
- Remove discretionary architectural design standards.

B-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-3.2	●		●	●		Short	\$	Low	

B-3.3 Revise open space and recreation area requirements for larger multifamily projects (13+ units), to reduce competition for site area on the highest density projects and thereby incentivize higher density development. Exempt any units over the minimum density or over 30 units/acre from triggering additional open space area.

B-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-3.3		●	●	●		Short	\$	Low	

B-4.1 Build on strong ADU provisions by:

- Removing parking requirements entirely (currently allowed on-street or off-street) or providing targeted parking reductions for ADUs located near transit similar to reductions allowed in recently adopted state SSB 6617.

- Increasing allowed ADU size for all dwellings to a maximum of 800 square feet, rather than tying to the size of the existing dwelling which penalizes smaller dwellings.
- Removing minimum unit size of 150 square feet.
- Removing the discretionary design requirement for ADUs to be “architecturally compatible” with primary residence.
- Providing alternative to standard requiring detached ADUs to be located 10 feet to side or rear of primary dwelling, for flexibility on sites where primary dwelling is set far back on the property.
- Allowing more than one ADU on a property, such as a basement conversion and a detached unit.
- Permitting ADUs in the Mixed Use (MX) zone through the general ADU standards in Section 40.260.020 rather than separate MX standards.

B-4	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-4.1	●		●	●		Short	\$	Low	

B-5.2.1 Expand permissions for RVs and tiny homes to be placed in RV parks in a greater number of commercial zones. Permit RV parks within the Community Commercial zone, beyond the General Commercial zone where they are already permitted, and explore any related modifications to RV park standards that could better support this affordable residential alternative. (Note: RVs are already permitted within manufactured home parks, currently permitted in medium and high-density residential and Office Residential (OR) zones.)

B-5	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-5.2.1	●	●	●	●		Short	\$	Low	

C-1.1.1 Reduce development review times and permitting requirements.

- Reduce development review timelines for low-income housing projects by allowing concurrent review of preliminary land use and final engineering applications. Also allow submittal of building permit application any time after preliminary review approval.
- Allow triplex and quadplex applications that require road or sidewalk improvements to be reviewed through a Type I site plan review with concurrent final engineering review.
- Clarify the standards and procedures for “Uses Subject to Review and Approval” under CCC 40.520.020.

C-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
C-1.1.1	●	●	●			Medium	\$	Low	

F-2.1.1 Adopt a “visitability” program, either with voluntary incentives and/or code requirements, for the construction of a percentage of new housing units (where there are three or more units proposed) that include the following visitability standards:

- A no step, barrier-free entrance.
- A bathroom and small living area accessible to the main entrance.
- 32-inch-wide internal doors between the entrance, the bathroom and the living area for wheelchair accessibility.

F-2	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin	Potential
-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	----------	------	-------	-----------

								Effort	Impact
F-2.1.1				●		Short	\$\$	Medium	

- F-3.1 Review code to ensure there are no barriers to the conversion of existing motels and hotels into permanent affordable housing. Could specify only allowed for certain housing types, such as housing that meets certain affordability criteria.

F-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
F-3.1		●				Short	\$	Low	

- F-4.1 Revise the definitions of “household,” “housekeeping unit,” and “family” per SB 5235/RCW 35.21 to remove numbers of unrelated persons that may define a household, a family, or occupy a dwelling unit. Need to complete full review of code to identify specifics of where this is needed. The number of people that can occupy a dwelling unit would be based on building safety code requirements instead of an arbitrary number in the development code.

F-4	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
F-4.1		●		●		Short	\$	Low	

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- D-2.3 Implement bonus density for Affordable Housing on Religious Organizations’ Land (RCW 36.70A.545): state law requires that properties owned by religious organizations be eligible for increased density bonuses, provided they exclusively serve low-income tenants for 50 years and are located within an urban growth area. In this case, jurisdictions may develop policies based on the level of need for the proposed housing and the ability of infrastructure to handle increased density.

The RCW includes definitions for “affordable housing development,” “low-income household,” and “religious organization.” Low-income households are defined by household adjusted income less than eighty percent of the median family income, adjusted for household size, for the county where the affordable housing development is located. The law does not specify bonus density amounts.

D-2	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
D-2.3		●	●	●	●	Medium	\$	Med	

PROGRAMS AND PARTNERSHIPS

- D-5.1 Create an affordable housing point of contact to provide education resources and help developers understand and use the various affordable housing incentives.

D-5	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
D-5.1		●	●		●	Medium	\$\$	Med	

ADVOCACY

- D-1.1 Counties are not currently eligible for the multi-family tax exemption under RCW 84.14. Continue Council advocacy efforts to expand the multi-family tax exemption under RCW 84.14 to counties. Consider implementing income target in the 50% to 80% AMI range.

D-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
D-1.1		●	●		●	Long	\$\$\$	Med	

- F-1.1. Support legislative changes (SB 5024) that would fix issues with the state's condominium defect liability law that has contributed to a condominium construction drought by encouraging frivolous lawsuits.

F-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
F-1.1			●			Long	\$	Low	

Tier 2 Strategies

CODE CHANGES

A-4.1 Study need for future upzoning of existing County land and/or higher-density zoning for new land as it is brought into the Urban Growth Area.

- Look at designating additional land for high-density residential to support multifamily development, and for medium-density residential to support a range of more dense, more varied housing types relative to low-density areas. Develop criteria that would identify where to apply higher-density zones.
- Look at rezoning selected commercial properties for high-density residential use. Develop criteria to guide selection of targeted properties.

A-4	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-4.1	●		●		●	Medium	\$\$	Medium	

A-4.4 The county and cities will need to adopt housing affordability metrics as part of the next Comprehensive Plan update per state mandate. These metrics are to be reported on the Buildable Lands Report and jurisdictions will have to take reasonable measures to meet the housing affordability metrics, if they are not met. Discuss the Countywide Planning Policy regarding the 75/25 split between single-family detached housing and alternatives to single-family detached housing with all local jurisdictions during the Comprehensive Plan update process as part of the housing affordability discussion, to see if the ratio still makes sense or should be adjusted by all jurisdictions. If the ratio is adjusted, upzone land within jurisdictions as needed to meet the new ratio.

A-4	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-4.4	●		●			Medium	\$	Medium	

A-5.1.2 Introduce courtyard apartment use to allow small-scale apartment development of 5-12 units by permitting at higher densities in medium-density zones and developing alternative design standards.

A-5	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-5.1.2	●		●	●		Medium	\$	Medium	

A-5.6 Study ongoing housing production trends and prevalence of certain housing types in limited medium and high-density-zoned land.

- If single-family detached uses predominate in medium-density zones, create greater opportunity for higher-density, middle housing development either by prohibiting single-family detached dwellings or limiting them to a portion of a PUD development.
- If townhouse uses predominate in high-density zones, encourage variety of other housing types particularly apartments by either prohibiting townhouses or limiting them to a portion of a PUD development.

A-5	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
A-5.6	●		●	●		Medium	\$	Medium	

B-1.6.2 Study reductions to off-street parking minimums for multifamily residential, currently set at 1.5 spaces for all units regardless of size, location, or resident characteristics. Consider any or all of the following targeted revisions:

- Introduce differentiated parking ratios based on unit size, such as 1 space per unit for studios and one-bedrooms, and 1.5 or 2 spaces for two bedroom and larger units, to encourage smaller units to serve forecasted growth in small households.
- Reduce parking requirements for high-density multifamily over 30 units/acre, where parking requirements can effectively cap the maximum density because of site area limitations and costs. Consider an across-the-board percentage reduction (5-20%, potentially increasing proportionate with density), or capping parking requirements equal to 30 units/acre regardless of additional units constructed.
- Introduce reduced parking ratios for regulated affordable housing projects that do not qualify for transit-based reductions under SHB 2343.
- Introduce reduced parking ratios for senior housing developments that do not qualify for transit-based reductions under SHB 2343.

Alternatively, parking requirements could be reduced through across-the-board reductions for all multifamily residential, or through a discretionary, site-specific review process. Targeted, by-right reductions such as the above strategies are the preferred approach because they combine a degree of precision with a greater degree of certainty.

B-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-1.6.2	●	●	●	●	●	Medium	\$\$	Medium	

B-2.1 Explore adding flexibility in the commercial and mixed-use zones to support residential development by:

- Reduce amount of ground-floor commercial use required to a portion of the ground-floor, strategically located along some or all of the street-facing frontage.
- Permitting active ground-floor use areas rather than ground-floor retail requirements that increase activity levels along street-facing facades. Examples could include resident community rooms, lobbies, or outdoor plaza space; spaces would be required to meet design parameters such as minimum interior height and minimum window covering to promote transparency and connection.
- Permitting horizontal configurations of commercial and residential space, such as developing a percentage of the total site area, to be located along the street frontage or corner, as stand-alone commercial with the remainder of the site available for multistory residential development, rather than only permitting upper-story residential development.

B-2	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-2.1	●	●			●	Short	\$	Low	

B-2.3. Explore options to increase access to neighborhood-scale retail and service uses, such as coffee shops, within residential neighborhoods through measures such as:

- Reviewing the extent of current Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning, and developing criteria to designate additional NC sites.
- Expanding the allowed scope of retail and service uses permitted as home occupations within commercial zones.
- Permitting limited scale retail and services uses in the high-density residential zones, potentially limited to a percentage of the site and/or to key locations such as corners or along higher-classification roads.
- Developing economic development efforts to recruit and support small-scale retail and service uses, such as small grant programs or entrepreneur training programs.

B-2	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-2.3		●			●	Medium	\$-\$	Medium	

B-3.1 Revisit cross-circulation requirements within Highway 99 subarea particularly along Highway 99 itself, to better understand potential impacts on development feasibility as part of a broader cross-circulation project.

B-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-3.1	●		●	●	●	Medium	\$	Medium	

B-5.1 Study existing manufactured home parks, identify potential for displacement, and develop strategies to reduce or mitigate displacement. Consider development of a manufactured home park zone where other redevelopment options are limited, there are restrictions on discontinuing manufactured home parks uses, and/or enhanced notification, relocation assistance, and opportunities to convert to tenant ownership in the event of park closures.

B-5	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-5.1	●	●	●	●		Medium	\$	Medium	

B-5.2.2 Explore potential for RVs and tiny homes to provide lower-cost residential opportunities on individual residential lots and/or in RV parks within high-density residential zones. Study emerging models in peer cities to allow residential use of RVs or tiny homes as accessory to a single-family detached dwelling, potentially classified as an ADU.

B-5	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
B-5.2	●	●	●	●		Medium	\$	Medium	

C-1.1.2 Reduce development review times and permitting requirements. Review the land use and engineering standards used to review projects and identify if there are opportunities that would promote both efficiency in the review/application process and high-quality development, i.e. if a project meets certain requirements, then the landscaping standards could be reduced.

C-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
C-1.1.2	●	●	●			Medium	\$	Low	

- E-1.1 Revise impact fees so that they are less for smaller units. Consider incentivizing certain middle housing types by waiving fees for a set time period, or a certain number of applications. Discuss how costs to implement could be offset.

E-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
E-1.1	●		●	●		Medium	\$\$\$	Medium	

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- D-4.1 Throughout unincorporated Clark County, implement 80% impact fee reduction for affordable housing authorized by RCW 82.02.060.

D-4	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
D-4.1		●	●	●		Medium	\$\$\$	Med	

- E-1.2 Explore the potential of a County Tax Increment Financing (TIF) tool to support affordable housing goals and which geographies would be best suited for a TIF district.

E-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
E-1.2	●		●	●		Medium	\$\$	Medium	

- D-2.1. Explore bonuses for affordable housing and calibrate them to meet the unique needs of the study area. Strategies may include, but are not limited to:

- Density bonuses. For example, provide a density bonus of 100% in high density residential zones in exchange for developments that have at least 40% of apartments affordable to people at 60% area median income or below for at least 30 years.

D-2	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
D-2.1		●	●	●	●	Medium	\$	Med	

PROGRAMS AND PARTNERSHIPS

- C-1.2 Review the County's master permit program to determine if adjustments can be made to improve the program or if a different approach to master permitting is preferred.

C-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
C-1.2	●		●	●		Medium	\$\$	Medium	

- C-3.4 Develop a marketing/communication plan on any new changes to code or other strategies regarding housing options, including education efforts such as handouts and brochures explaining new regulations and what kind of middle housing is possible.

C-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
C-3.4	●		●	●		Medium	\$	Medium	

C-3.5 Monitor housing development over time, noting the number and type of units produced, sizes of units, density, parking provided, sale or rent levels, use of any fee or tax incentives, or other correlations between regulatory actions and resulting development trends. Consider providing profiles of representative projects as part of annual reports to support further regulatory revisions.

C-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
C-3.5	●	●	●	●	●	Short	\$\$	Low	

E-6.1 Create a mobile and manufactured home resource page on the County webpage. The page should include links to state programs for park preservation and relocation assistance.

- [Washington Department of Commerce Manufactured/Mobile Home Relocation Assistance Program](#)
- [Washington State Housing Finance Commission Preserving Manufactured Housing Communities](#)

E-6	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
E-6.1		●	●	●		Medium	\$\$	Medium	

G-1.1 Monitor/support state and partner efforts to monitor regulated affordable housing properties that are nearing their affordability expiration dates.

G-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
G-1.1		●				Short	\$	Low	

G-1.2 Adopt a "Notice of Intent to Sell/Sale Ordinance that requires owners of multifamily buildings to provide official notification to tenants and local housing officials. Examples of existing ordinances include [Seattle](#) and [Burien](#).

G-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
G-1.2		●				Medium	\$	Medium	

G-3.1. Identify ways in which the County can support Vancouver Housing Authority achieve its mission.

G-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
G-3.1		●	●			Short	\$	Low	

E-3.1 Inventory available public lands annually. Donate or lease public lands to affordable housing developers to reduce the cost of development and help make affordable housing projects more financially feasible.

E-3	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
E-3.1	●	●	●	●	●	Medium	\$\$	Medium	

F-2.1.2 Work with aging and disabilities advocates in the community to develop a universal design program to encourage more housing options for those in the community that are disabled or mobility challenged. The program could encourage the development of deaf-friendly units, blind-friendly units, and additional identified housing options needed to better serve our community members who have a disability.

F-2	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
F-2.1.2				●		Short	\$\$	Medium	

Tier 3 Strategies

CODE CHANGES

C-1.3 Supporting the initiative for electronic plan review.

C-1	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
C-1.3	●	●	●	●	●	Medium	\$\$	Medium	

G-4.1 Research short-term rental impacts in Clark County and, if needed, develop a County policy around short-term rentals.

G-4	Obj 1	Obj 2	Obj 3	Obj 4	Obj 5	Timeline	Cost	Admin Effort	Potential Impact
G-4.1		●	●			Medium	\$	Medium	

Current / Ongoing Strategies

- E-6.1 Continue to administer federal- and state-funded programs and support local partners. Programs may include:
- HOME Funds
 - Housing Trust Funds
 - Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
 - Low-Income Housing Tax Credit
 - Activity Bond Programs
 - HUD 811 and 202 Funds
- G-1.3 Continue to pursue partnerships and opportunities with community land trusts.
- G-3.3. Expand existing homeownership weatherization, rehabilitation, and energy assistance grants.

Strategies Removed from Consideration

- A-1.4 Introduce minimum lot sizes for triplexes and quadplexes where proposed in low and/or medium-density zones that are less than current lot area per dwelling unit. E.g., R-12 zone would currently require 14,520-square-foot lot for a quadplex based upon maximum density, compared to a proposed 8,000-square foot minimum specific to quadplexes.
- A-1.5 Create a new R1-2.5 zone with a 2,500-square foot minimum lot size for single-family detached and similarly scaled minimum lot sizes for middle housing.
- A-5.8 As an alternative to permitting outright across low-density zones, develop a middle housing overlay for low-density residential areas that allows middle housing types on smaller lots/at greater densities. Could apply in areas with better access to transit or amenities like parks, commercial nodes. Consider how it could apply to existing neighborhoods to support infill and/or to vacant lands to support new development
- A-6.1 Offer bonus density and/or height for larger multifamily projects (13+ units) in high-density zones, potentially based on residents served (age, income, abilities) or based on location near transit or other amenities.
- B-6.2 Revisit private road standard requiring sidewalks on only one side of road to determine if these meet pedestrian needs while providing site design flexibility. Delete.
- C-2.1 Use sub area planning as a tool to ensure new areas of development are built with neighborhood amenities. This strategy could work well in conjunction with a planned action as described above. Would need to identify areas where sub area planning could be useful.
- C-2.2 Use planned actions as a tool to streamline the review and permitting process and reduce the SEPA costs of individual projects. Would need to identify where planned actions could be useful.
- C-2.3 Write code that would provide a SEPA exemption for small scale infill development.
- C-3.1 Consider a time-limit or limited supply strategy for the development of certain housing types, such as ADUs, by offering financial incentives or impact fee waivers for the first ten projects, or in the first two years.
- C-3.2 Partner with community groups to host ADU workshops to share information about ADUs and for networking with builders and lenders. For example, Kol Peterson, a Portland-based ADU

advocate, offers workshops for homeowners to build ADUs (accessorydwellings.org). The Incremental Development Alliance offers workshops for small developers wanting to do middle housing. Another example of a community that has already done this is Lacey, WA: <http://www.ci.lacey.wa.us/city-government/city-departments/community-and-economic-development/building/new!-build-a-backyard-cottage>. Similar ideas could be used for other missing middle housing types as well.

- C-3.3 Create a housing demonstration project to test how well a certain new housing type would fit within the community and address community housing needs.
- D-1.2 Consider voluntary inclusionary zoning with a multifamily tax exemption program.
- D-2.2 Provide minimum lot size reductions for affordable housing (see *Guidance for Developing a Housing Action Plan*, page 130).
- D-3.1 Explore parking requirement reductions in exchange for affordable housing requirements. Focus on areas with access to transit. Consider identifying a process/project to analyze the specifics of the incentive. This strategy overlaps with the parking reduction strategy B-1.1.
- D-5.2 Identify and provide incentive for homeowners to rent out extra space or participate in shared housing program.
- D-5.3 Explore mandatory inclusionary zoning program options.
- F-1.2 Support legislative changes that would support locally-owned rental housing instead of out-of-state ownership.
- G-3.2 Support state legislation that invests in affordable housing, rental assistance, and tenant protections.
- G-3.4 Host homebuyer education program. Classes could educate renters on the homebuying process and provide resources on down payment assistance programs.
- G-3.5. Work with partners to provide resources on foreclosure assistance resources and programs. The county can also use eligible affordable housing funds to support foreclosure assistance and intervention programs and/or to support community land trusts to purchase foreclosed properties and restore ownership for residents.
- G-3.6 Support state legislative efforts that expand property tax assistance programs to people with low-incomes, who are elderly, and/or have a disability.